

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,
Appellee,

v.

NICHOLAS ROSS TAYLOR,
Appellant.

No. 2 CA-CR 2014-0109
Filed October 16, 2014

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24.

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County

No. CR20131577001

The Honorable Charles Sabalos, Judge

The Honorable Paul E. Tang, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Lori J. Lefferts, Pima County Public Defender
By Frank P. Leto, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Appellant

STATE v. TAYLOR
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Espinosa authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Miller and Judge Vásquez concurred.

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Nicholas Taylor was convicted of criminal damage in an amount of at least \$1,000 but less than \$2,000 and two counts of threatening and intimidating. The trial court suspended the imposition of sentence and placed Taylor on concurrent three-year terms of probation for each offense. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), asserting he has reviewed the record but found no arguable issue to raise on appeal. Consistent with *Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d at 97, he has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record” and asks this court to search the record for error.

¶2 Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdict, *see State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999), sufficient evidence supports the jury’s verdicts. In April 2013, Taylor defaced the windows of several businesses, causing several thousand dollars in damage. *See* A.R.S. § 13-1602(A)(1), (B)(4). When two individuals nearby physically restrained Taylor before his arrest, he threatened to return and harm them with the help of his “crews” or fellow gang members. *See* A.R.S. § 13-1202(A)(1). Furthermore, we find no error in the trial court’s imposition of probation. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-603(B), 13-901.

¶3 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (stating *Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental

STATE v. TAYLOR
Decision of the Court

error). Accordingly, Taylor's convictions and terms of probation are affirmed.